DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 599 UD 027 816

AUTHOR Pires, Laura J.
TITLE New York State Community School Pilot Project Spring Retreat Report (Rensselearville, New York, May 16-17, 1988).
INSTITUTION Edwin Gould Outdoor Education Centers, Brewster, N.Y.
PUB DATE 26 May 88
NOTE 58p.; For a related document, see UD 027 817.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; *Community Schools; Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Parent Participation; Preschool Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *School Community Relationship; *Social Services; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Collaboratives; *New York

ABSTRACT

This report on a spring retreat for participants in the New York State Community School Pilot Project emphasizes the need to develop and strengthen collaboration between schools and other organizations and individuals with widely diverse interests. Ninety-seven people attended, including representatives from each of the 14 school districts participating in the pilot project. The organizing theme of the retreat was "Forging Our Newtork for Change--Collaboration is the Key," and following accomplishments are reported: (1) clarification of the project's mission by advisory committee members, coordinators, principals, and superintendents; (2) sharing of experiences and plans, including an examination of programs in Syracuse, New York City, and Binghamton; (3) expansion of collaborative possibilities and resources; (4) preliminary identification of evaluation criteria and methods; and (5) evaluation of the conference. The following materials are appended: (1) the retreat program; (2) a list of eight features of community schools; (3) a report on the instructional model used in Syracuse; (4) a report on parental involvement programs in New York; (5) a report on early interventions and community linkages in Binghamton; (6) a copy of the retreat's evaluation questionnaire; and (7) an inventory of 1988/89 Social Services Request For Proposal Programs that support additional social services in community schools; and (8) a list of local school district contact persons for community schools initiatives. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EDWIN GOULD FOUNDATION FOR CHILDREN
126 East 31st Street • New York, New York 10016 • (212) 481-0170

CHARTERED 1923

ED327599

REPORT ON

NEW YORK STATE COMMUNITY SCHOOL PILOT PROJECT

SPRING RETREAT

May 16-17, 1988

The Rensselearville Institute
Rensselearville, N.Y.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Laura Pires
Edwin Gould Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Laura J. Pires, Program Officer
Sydelle Bloom, Consultant

The Edwin Gould Foundation for Children

May 26, 1988

UD 027 61C

The Report incorporates assessment observations and comments from Cynthia Parsons, Juan Rodriquez-Munoz, Lew Smith, and Tom Webber. Thanks and appreciation are extended to them and all the participants who contributed to the Retreat.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION	5
III	SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS	7
	A MISSION CLARIFICATION	7
	B SHARING EXPERIENCES AND PLANS	10
	1 Examining Program Features	10
	2 Forging Networks	13
	3 Clarifying Budgetary Issues	14
	C EXPANDING COLLABORATIVE POSSIBILITIES AND RESOURCES	16
	D PRELIMINARY IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHODS	19
IV	PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK	20
V	NEXT STEPS	22

APPENDICES
A RETREAT PROGRAM
B COMMUNITY SCHOOL FEATURES
C SYRACUSE: TURNING INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL AROUND
D NYC COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 7: PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT STRATEGIES
E BINGHAMTON: FORGING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS
F FEEDBACK
G SOCIAL SERVICES RESOURCES

I INTRODUCTION

The New York State Community Schools Pilot Project depends for its success on effective program development within each of the fourteen Pilot School Districts as well as on the promotion of a Project-wide identity and ethos. This duality underlies the Edwin Gould Foundation's role in technical assistance, training, and coordination and makes essential the periodic in-gathering of all participants and partners.

The Project's first meeting was held on March 7, 1988 in Albany (Note 1). Its primary objectives were to present the Community Schools Project mission, from the perspective of Commissioner Thomas Sobol and the Regents; to discuss individual District plans; and to introduce the variety of resources and support available to the Project from the State Education Department, the State Department of Social Services, other State agencies, and the Edwin Gould Foundation.

Between March and May, Cycle I and Cycle II schools had focussed on revising their budgets; disseminated information to their communities about the Community Schools Project; developed representative Advisory Committees; recruited and/or hired coordinators and begun discussions within their schools among administrative, teaching and support personnel about the implications of the Community School designation. District project participants expressed a strong desire to share experiences and questions; and to learn from each other. There was concern about the "how-to's" of Community Schools (for instance, what was especially different about it and how were persons and organizations <u>outside</u> the school to become "partners"?) Although Cycle III schools were not to be funded until July, they had begun planning, and were raising similar questions; they too were included in the Spring Retreat.

At the same time, State Task Force activity had generated both general and specific resources for collaboration, especially from the Department of Social Services.

From the questions and nature of this preparation effort, the organizing theme for the Spring Retreat emerged: <u>Forging Our Network For Change - Collaboration Is The Key</u>. Four primary objectives were identified:

1. To clarify the Community Schools mission: specific features, overall goals, broader context;
2. To provide opportunity to share experience, insights, and plans;
3. To explore implications of multi-faceted collaboration;
4. To practice some techniques for planning, group facilitation, and leadership-building.

The Spring Retreat, scheduled for May 16-17, 1988 at the Rensselearville Institute, was thus organized to capture and build on the growing momentum at local and state levels.

To address these objectives, Regent Louise P. Matteoni's opening remarks stressed the Regent's deep commitment to the Project and recognition of collaboration as a necessity for the sake of the children. Commissioner of Social Services Cesar Perales reported new and creative initiatives being developed by his agency and local Commissioners and reinforced their readiness to cooperate. Regent Laura Chodos' participation in various parts of the program and her availability for informal interactions demonstrated the potential that resides in new kinds of linkages.

Special guests, (Alec and Mora Dickson of Voluntary Services Overseas, London, England; Norbert Hill, Jr., (Oneida) of the American Indian Science and Engineering Society and Ana-Helvia Quintero, University of Puerto Rico) were invited so that the Retreat would be opened to an even broader multi-cultural national and international point of view. They delivered prepared remarks and were integral parts of the workshops and informal discussions. In addition, members of the Statewide Advisory Committee participated fully in discussions (two were Facilitators) thus confirming the broad support for the Project.

The Retreat was structured to allow for peer groups to identify role responsibilities and for mixed groups to discover the benefits and risks of collaboration. Facilitators were asked to use a variety of techniques that could be used in home Districts by coordinators and other Community School participants as catalysts for collaborative involvement. They included: brainstorming; small group discussions; dyadic problem-solving; large group sharing and feedback; debate preparation; identifying pro's and con's; and multi-media presentations.

Throughout, it was stressed that the Retreat was part of an ongoing developmental process, with each District at different stages and perhaps emphasizing different features, but all affirming the necessity for openness to and collaboration with organizations and individuals representing widely diverse interests. Collaboration must be strengthened within the school; within the developing Advisory Committees; between the school and its immediate community segments (parents, social service providers, community-based organizations, business, etc.); and with other state and local resources. The mission is not achievable overnight.

This "Community Schools in Progress" theme was further illustrated through the Display/Resource Area exhibits (Note 2).

II ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION

Ninety-seven (97) persons attended the Spring Retreat, almost one third more than initially-anticipated. Of these, sixty-four attended for the two full days. (Appendix A identifies attendees by role and District.) Most important, all fourteen Districts were represented, each having at least three representatives for part of the time.

Advisory Council members included two social service providers representatives, one Community-based organizational representative, three parents, one PTA President, and two School Board Presidents. Eight coordinators attended, with the remaining Districts represented by "interim" coordinators. Thirteen Principals were in attendance, twelve of them for the entire two days. One teacher was present, a fact noted at the closing session and indicative of the developmental work still to be done. Nonetheless, this broad representation, illustrates the serious commitment to achieving the community School mission at the local levels.

In addition, there were participants from a wide range of organizations crucial to the forward movement of the project: New York State Board of Regents and State Education Department; New York State Department of Social Services; New York State Department of Health; New York State Division for Youth; Edwin Gould Foundation staff, consultants, Statewide Advisory Committee, and Board of Trustees; United Federation of Teachers; Bruner Foundation Consultant, and Evaluation and Business Consultants. All provided resources and ideas that were seized upon for immediate follow-up. Special guests (Alec and Mora Dickson from Voluntary Services Overseas, London, England; Norbert Hill, Jr. American Indian Science and Engineering Society; and Ana-Helvia Quintero University of Puerto Rico) were invited to provide multi-cultural international points of view.

Attendance at each of the sessions was excellent and participation active. Floating between workshops was limited to those who had that designated role. High workshop attendance seemed due to the motivation of the participants, the content-description and focus of the workshop, careful assignment of all participants (including late-comers), and to the continuous presence of a group "dispatcher" in the central registration area.

III SUMMARY OF RETREAT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Strides were made in four important areas: mission clarification, sharing and comparing experiences and plans, exploration of the issues of collaboration and identification of evaluation criteria.

A. Mission Clarification

Initial statement of the Community Schools mission by Commissioner Thomas Sobol (Appendix B) was first shared with participants at the March 7 meeting and included in pre-Retreat mailings and the Retreat training package. This basic document was referred to throughout the Retreat.

In any change process it is important for participants to understand the mission and equally important, its operational implications. Four groups, Advisory Committee members, coordinators, principals, superintendents, were therefore asked to address two questions:

- How would you define the mission?
- How do you help make it happen, in a collaborative context?

Feedback reports showed a good grasp of the mission's dimensions and especially supported the need for participants to move beyond traditional boundaries. The process of struggling with new roles or familiar roles in new ways was reflected in the discussions. The reports are summarized below:

1. Advisory Committee Members

"The mission of the Community Schools Pilot Project is to firmly establish a vested interest of the community in their Public Schools. There needs to be a shared sense of ownership which will enable all citizens in the community to develop and enhance their own lives.

In order to fulfill this mission, we will develop a community plan that will include the identification and assessment of the needs and resources of the community.

The Advisory Committee in collaboration with all of the community will develop a plan that includes programs which address these needs. The processes by which the Advisory Committee shall work will include; facilitation, coordination, communication and cooperation." (Statement in full from Discussion Group).

2. Coordinators

In this session each person was asked to choose a word that they most closely associated with the mission. "Caring/sharing" words predominated: "community as educators"; "holistic", "melding" (as distinguished from "brokering"); "cooperative", "organic", "partnership", "conceptual and contextual." This emphasis is not surprising since it is the Coordinators who will have the challenging role of bringing the various actors and pieces together.

The group also acknowledged that "we don't have to make a community, but have to serve the community that is there".

A mission component mentioned publicly only by this group was that teacher education must change to prepare teachers for a new collaborative effort, community outreach, and community involvement.

3. Principals

Principals, as a group, stressed the ultimate goal of educational achievement, seen by one participant as "pupils becoming literate citizens," but there was clear acknowledgement of the need to address social, health, and recreational needs of children and their families. Written statements referred to "breaking down barriers: "school as community and community as school" and "parents and educators as one." One participant saw the ultimate mission as a "reality...of one goal, one destiny, one school."

The necessity for principals "to take ownership" of the Community School process was emphasized, but "turf" differences were acknowledged. Rules included fostering a positive school climate, goal-setting and risk-taking.

4. Superintendents

The group participated in an animated discussion about the mission of community schools and about the role of the superintendents, as individuals and as a group. There was general agreement on the following points:

* all schools should be community schools, not just part of a special state initiative;

* school people themselves have to "put their own house in order" and reshape how they think about their roles and responsibilities as administrators and teachers in the holistic education of all children;

* superintendents should be the catalysts that get the community school concept rolling and should provide those "on the front lines" with the resources, climate, and the independence to create true community schools;

* superintendents should take the lead in garnering support for the community school concept in the larger arenas of higher education, business, unions, media, elected officials, etc.;

* although there is general agreement about the need for community schools, it is still far from clear how to do all the things necessary to create them and make them work;

* it would be useful for the superintendents to meet periodically as a group to help each other and to discuss mechanisms for supporting the entire concept.

B. Sharing Experiences and Plans

1. Examining Program Features

Program features from three different Districts were presented: redesign of an instructional model; parental involvement; and establishing collaborative relationships. They were introduced as illustrative examples of how essential parts of the Community School model were being implemented, not (individually or collectively) as "perfected" model. Their introduction led to much informal exchange among participants and plans for follow-up visitations.

Judith Brooks (Principal, Dr. Martin Luther King School, Syracuse) presented an audio/slide tape of the successful two-year process (Appendix C) for redesigning an instructional model. In response to New York State Education Department's Comprehensive Assessment Report designation of the school, in 1985, the School Principal and staff, with Superintendent's support, redesigned the instructional approach. Newly-adopted six-week units, organized around six themes, allowed for more integrated teaching and learning, weekly collaborative planning sessions by teachers and resource staff, and more effective communications with parents to involve them in their children's learning. The strategies resulted in demonstrable gains in student achievement, leading to the removal of Comprehensive Assessment Report designation in 1988. (See Appendix C, page 7 for specific details of achievements)

Carmen Rodriquez (Superintendent, New York City Community School District 7) discussed the District's fifteen years of parental involvement strategies and the new directions in this area (Appendix D). School Board members and staff have had to initiate new strategies in order to meet current needs generated by a 50% loss in student population and significantly younger and less skilled parents.

The District continues earlier strategies of supporting parents' roles as instructional partners and motivator of their children's learning. In addition, however, the strategies must also meet more and more of the parents' own needs: for adult basic and continuing education, for employment and parenting skills, and reinforcement of their own personal and cultural strengths. Effectiveness of these multiple strategies has been demonstrated in regular participation by significant numbers of parents and family members (including males) in daytime and evening programs. To cope with risks in the neighborhoods, persons often attend in small groups at night.

The Community School Project will further focus on enhancing parental involvement strategies in the elementary school, as a part of a continuum of service from the early childhood through middle school years. (The adjoining Middle School will be the facility most used for evening activities. The Project will also reach out particularly to currently "uninvolved" parents and families, through those who have become regular participants.

The third presentation (Appendix E) (by Frank Cleary, Nathan Bell and Mary Haust, Superintendent, Director of Planning and Evaluation, and Project Coordinator respectively of the Binghamton Community School Project) focussed on development of collaborative relationships. Based upon the Missouri Early Intervention approach, Binghamton's Parents and Children Together (PACT) program is directed toward helping parents become better first teachers of their children. To support this approach, the Project has developed an effective and diverse Advisory Council which meets regularly to monitor the program, assess needs, and to prevent duplication of services among community service providers. With designation of MacArthur Elementary School as the Community School, the next step will be to integrate PACT more closely with the school itself and to generate and support teacher involvement.

2. Forging Networks

The mutual interest and support evolving from formal and informal connections made during the Retreat was the strongest accomplishment, cited by Claudio Prieto as "exceeding our highest expectations".

The network-building process was clearly accelerated:

* Superintendents agreed to meet again as a group to discuss challenges which they now perceived to be common and work toward adaptive solutions.

* Arrangements for site-to-site visits were made. For example, Addison, a predominantly white rural, low-income area, and New York City District 4, a heavily Hispanic inner city area, not only plan site visits but are thinking about student exchange. Interestingly the Addison Community School Principal (in an area of no Hispanic population) has initiated Spanish for all students from second to sixth grade.

* Prior to the Retreat, telephone contacts had been made between Poughkeepsie and Binghamton, Rochester and Syracuse, and among New York City Districts; and visits had been exchanged between at least Poughkeepsie and Binghamton. Malone representatives had expressed the strong desire to visit New York City schools, especially to break down the "upstate/downstate" tendency, and City schools were most receptive. However, this had not actually occurred yet. The personal contacts made at the Retreat assured that these plans would now become reality.

* Formal and informal exchanges also stimulated recognition of peers' greater experience and savvy, and requests for assistance. For example, a new principal prevailed upon a "veteran"to share more about how he had accomplished certain outcomes. This is significant in a professional arena where too often the negatives are highlighted and individuals are not often affirmed.

3. Budgetary Clarification

District Staff involved with fiscal matters raised and clarified fiscal issues directly with State Education Department representatives, Nancy Croce and Bernie McInerney. Staff also shared with each other their various approaches to similar issues, for example, coordinator job titles, union implications, etc. Urgent fiscal issues were clarified:

* Funds could indeed be "rolled over" from June to August 1988;

* As of July, 1988, Community Schools Project budget matters would be handled directly with SED;

* Each attending District was provided with the appropriate Budget Forms and timetables for the next submission;

District Office staff confirmed that this small-group experience was invaluable in confirming State Education Department support for facilitating local project development and in learning about other approaches to critical "nitty-gritty" aspects of the Project. For greatest success, "process" must always be supported by sturdy "structure".

C. Expanding Collaborative Possibilities and Resources

The importance of collaboration in achieving the Community Schools mission and meeting the diverse needs of children and families in the State's distressed areas is critical. At the Retreat, the collaboration theme was explored in both theory and practice. Besides the significant presence by Commissioner Perales and his staff, participants discussed issues, incentives, and challenges, of collaboration. They also were provided with specific "how-to's. In one session, they went through the process of constructing a hypothetical Advisory Committee. Another Workshop provided information on specific Social Services programs and resources and the designated "contact persons" in each Community School District (Appendix G), and requested Community Schools participants to identify home district service needs so as to facilitate more effective departmental response.

In the Workshop on "Education and Social Services Collaboration", participants were asked to assume roles as educators and social service providers and present to each other positive reasons for collaboration. In doing so, they had to anticipate possible objections from the "other side", thus identifying real and/or perceived obstacles and ways to overcome them. Specified obstacles included differences in style, professional definitions, working conditions, credentialing procedures, evaluation timetables and processes. These factors were remarkably similar to a review of existing research on issues in interagency involvement (a one-page summary of these issues was distributed), thereby validating the participants' own ideas.

In keeping with the Retreat's overall atmosphere and its goal of forward movement, participants also identified incentives for collaboration:

* enormity and urgency of needs (social, educational, health, income)

* potential of combination of resources to meet the needs

* enough work to go around

* need to develop broader support for education in communities of changing demographics (and therefore tax bases)

* more positive response by funding sources to collaborative efforts

* the potential of school-social services linkage to improve school performance.

The lively and enriching discussions demonstrated growing understanding and appreciation of the issues, the need to resolve those issues, an optimism that it could indeed by done, and practical steps for implementation.

In the Workshop on "Building Advisory Committees" (probably the most challenging of Community School tasks, if partnership is to be real), participants were again asked to move from the theoretical to the practical. The process started first with "meg-questions" (eg, what is the ideal number, composition of the Committee; should the Committee have funds for carrying out agreed-upon tasks; then to consideration of how constituent members should be chosen; then finally to actually from a Committee for one Community School.

The majority saw the Advisory Committee as no more than twenty, although one Committee of seven seemed to operating effectively. In terms of composition, most saw the Coordinator and Principal as members, at least one teacher and another School staff member. Almost none envisioned a Committee made up of only non-school personnel. The most controversial question had to do with sharing of funds, and this produced the strongest comments and debate (for most, this was not a foregone conclusion). In the discussion, it seemed apparent that membership from some constituencies had not been considered and might now be looked at.

As expected, the implementation of collaborative relationships, and identification and garnering of appropriate resources are ongoing challenges and will require continuing examination, assistance, and assessment. What was accomplished here was the surfacing of the complexities and the need to consider previously-ignored realities.

D. Preliminary Identification of Evaluation Criteria and Methods

At the closing session, participants were asked to identify at least one criterion by which they would like to be evaluated. Responses included both criteria and methods, and provide a useful "first-cut" of dimensions that seem most important to Community Schools participants themselves. The responses embrace most areas that should be considered in a comprehensive evaluation and reflect qualitative as well as quantitative features.

A. Criteria

1. How well does the Advisory Committee function?
2. Have Community School plans been implemented? Begun?
3. Are program functioning? Well? Poorly? What steps have been taken or planned? Who did the planning?
4. How has the Project influenced growth and improvement of children/parents in the community?
5. Have new people been brought into the school?
6. In what new ways have people been involved in the community?
7. Is there a change in school climate? What is the degree of creativity? What is the degree of enthusiasm?
8. How much more are the kids themselves becoming doers and resources for the community?
9. How many of other providers are involved in a collaborative way?
10. What is the number of participants?
11. What is the degree of overall academic improvement (including standardized tests)?
12. What accomplishments have occurred in schools?
13. How is the school now perceived by the community?
14. Has attendance improved?
15. Has there been increase in parental involvement, in youth involvement, community involvement?
16. How successful have we been in informing our community agencies?
17. Do students feel part of the Community School?
18. What is the degree of teacher participation, both in planning and directing the project?

B. Methods

1. On site observation
2. Evidence to support claims made for enthusiasm, participation, creativity, use of minutes, documentation, logs, journals, etc..
3. Impact survey, Perhaps devised by parents, teachers, community leaders
4. A variety of evaluative tools may be necessary to evaluate the variety of activities.

IV PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

Of the ninety-seven participants, thirty-nine returned Feedback Sheets (see Appendix F). Five of the returned sheets were from participants who had attended Monday's sessions only.

The overall assessment of the Retreat was gratifyingly positive, as indicated below.

		*VH	H	NH	DNA
1.	How would you rate the "Commissioners' Dialogue" on Monday afternoon in terms of providing you with information, ideas or resources about how to create an effective community school?	5	11	9	3
2.	How would you rate the session "Toward Community Schools: Examples of Program Features?"	6	24	3	1
3.	How would you rate the small group discussions held on Monday afternoon?	17	16	-	3
	Which group did you attend? 6 A - Advisory Committee 6 B - Coordinators 9 C - Principals 6 D - Superintendents 7 E - Budget Staff				
4.	How would you rate the Monday evening session, "State & Local Resources for Community Schools?	9	11	-	8
5.	How would you rate the Monday evening presentations, Getting Closer to Community Schools?	8	17	5	-
6.	How would you rate the small group discussions held on Tuesday morning?	23	8	-	-

7. How would you rate the closing session held on Tuesday Afternoon?	7	9	2	3
8. How would you rate the overall retreat in terms of providing you with information, ideas or resources about how to create an effective community school?	18	17	-	

* VH: Very Helpful; H: Helpful; NH: Helpful; DNA: Did Not Attend

Volunteered comments on the back of the feedback sheets were characteristically diverse. There were numerous expressions of enthusiasm and personal congratulations for a "great conference-tightly packed while maintaining an atmosphere that encouraged idea-sharing and generated enthusiasm". One principal complained that the retreat was "much too intense", "overscheduled", and "the atmosphere was too heavy", while another principal thought the balance between structure and informality just right. There were several expressions of interest in a follow-up meeting with Commissioner Sobol, and other requests for a follow-up retreat, and a newsletter.

V NEXT STEPS

The Spring Retreat's wide diversity of participants demonstrated the broad support for the Community School mission and potential. It also served to affirm the efforts of those involved most directly in trying to make the mission real--agency representatives, school personnel, and parents, for example. In a change effort of this magnitude, that kind of affirmation is essential. In the words of Alec Dickson, such a "grand ideal" is worth working at, and demands the passionate persistence of "hunters of hope" such as they.

Technical assistance and training steps will include regional Department of Social Services workshops to respond to local situations and needs; training sessions to assist in development of parental involvement, and setting up and working through issues of representation on Advisory Committees; finalizing plans for specific program pieces such as Pre-Kindergarten and summer programs; and addressing the needs of newly-hired Coordinators.

From all indications, the Retreat did indeed promote project-wide identity and mutual support and moved us further toward developing the Community Schools Project "network for change".

NOTES

1. This was attended by 52 persons, from: the first 10 Districts (Cycle I, 4 schools continuing from 1987 Community Renewal funding; and Cycle II, 6 new schools scheduled for March funding); New York State Education Department; Edwin Gould Foundation Staff and Advisory Committee; New York State Department of Social Services; New York State Board of Regents, and the Office of the Governor. Special guests included a representative of the Office of the Governor of Florida, a volunteer Business Consultant and a representative of the New York City Council President's office.

2. Resource and Display Area included: (1) source materials from the Districts (Manuals, press releases, flyers to their communities, News Articles, Handbooks, instructional materials, etc.); (2) articles and books for distribution i.e., papers by Alec Dickson and another by Barbara Blum; Toward a More Perfect Union, Occasional Report from the Ford Foundation Project on Social Welfare Policy; New York State Education Department and Community Renewal Reports on Assessment of Need in Distressed Communities and Regents Policy and Service Models; and (3) Display Only copies of other related materials; e.g., Mott Foundation/Annual Report on Community Education; Open Doors: A Community Schools Handbook, a Canadian publication; Foundations of Community Education, a 1987 Community Collaborators publication, School Power by James Comer, Seeds by Cynthia Parsons, and Business-Education Partnerships, published by the Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands. Participants were also urged to join the National Community Education Association.

APPENDICES

A. Retreat Program

B. Eight Community School Features

C. Syracuse: Turning the Instructional Model Around

D. New York City District 7: Parental Involvement Programs

E. Binghamton: Earliest Interventions and Community Linkages

F. Feedback Sheet

G. Social Services
   1. Inventory of Social Services 1988-89 RFP Programs which support Community Schools.
   2. Local Social Services Districts contact persons for Community Schools initiative.

Appendix A

NEW YORK STATE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PILOT PROJECT

SPRING RETREAT

FORGING OUR NETWORK FOR CHANGE -- COLLABORATION IS THE KEY

May 16-17, 1988
Rensselaerville Institute
Rensselaerville, New York

State Education Department
Albany, New York

The Edwin Gould Foundation
for Children
New York, New York

OBJECTIVES

TO CLARIFY COMMUNITY SCHOOLS MISSION: SPECIFIC FEATURES, OVERALL GOALS, BROADER CONTEXT

TO PROVIDE OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE EXPERIENCE, INSIGHTS, AND PLANS

TO EXPLORE IMPLICATIONS OF MULTI-FACETED COLLABORATION

TO PRACTICE SOME TECHNIQUES FOR PLANNING, GROUP FACILITATION, LEADERSHIP-BUILDING

MONDAY MAY 16, 1988

10:45am - 11:45am **REGISTRATION** Guggenheim Auditorium

12:00pm - 12:45pm **LUNCH** Weathervane

1:00pm - 2:30pm **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS** Guggenheim Auditorium

Schuyler M. Meyer, Jr., President
Edwin Gould Foundation for Children

Claudio R. Prieto, Assistant to the
Commissioner for Policy Analysis,
New York State Education Department

OPENING REMARKS

Louise P. Matteoni, Regent
New York State Board of Regents

COMMISSIONERS' DIALOGUE

Thomas Sobol, Commissioner
New York State Education Department

Cesar Perales, Commissioner
New York State Department of Social Services

This session will provide a framework for definition and expectations of the Community Schools Pilot Project. Diverse resources available to support the Project will also be explored.

2:30pm - 3:30pm **TOWARD COMMUNITY SCHOOLS: EXAMPLES OF PROGRAM FEATURES**
Guggenheim Auditorium

TURNING AROUND THE INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL
Judith M. Brooks, Principal,
Dr. Martin Luther King School, Syracuse

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT
Carmen Rodriguez, Superintendent, New York City Community School District 7 (Bronx)

FORGING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS
Mary Haust, Project Coordinator,
MacArthur School, Binghamton

Presenters will suggest principles for further discussion.

3:30pm - 3:45pm **COFFEE BREAK**

3:45pm - 5:15pm **TOWARD COMMUNITY SCHOOLS:** Small Group Discussions

A. ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Conference Room 3
Facilitators: Barbara B. Blum, Juan Munoz-Rodriquez

B. COORDINATORS **Master Seminar Room**
Facilitators: Mora Dickson, Cynthia Parsons

C. PRINCIPALS **Guggenheim Auditorium**
Facilitators: David Seeley, Lew Smith

D. SUPERINTENDENTS **Huyck House Living Room**
Facilitators: Paul Haley, Mildred Jones

E. BUDGET STAFF **Conference Room 2**
Facilitators: Nancy Croce, Peter Murphy

Each group will discuss these two questions:
* In your own words, what is the mission of the Communtiy Schools Pilot Project?
* How do you help make this happen?

5:30pm - 6:00pm **FEEDBACK REPORTS**

6:00pm - 6:45pm **STATE AND LOCAL RESOURCES FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**
Huyck House Living Room

Alexandria Douglas
Director of "No Time to Lose" and "Decade of the Child", New York State Department of Social Services

6:00pm - 7:00pm **COCKTAILS - CASH BAR** **Weathervane**

7:00pm - 8:30pm **DINNER** **Weathervane**

8:45pm - 9:45pm **GETTING CLOSER TO COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**
Stonecrop Living Room

Alec and Mora Dickson
Voluntary Services Overseas, London, England

Norbert S. Hill, Jr. (Oneida)
Executive Director,
American Indian Science and Engineering Society

Ana-Helvia Quintero
University of Puerto Rico

Respondents will share reactions to reports and suggest broader perspectives and contexts.

9:45pm - **EVENING REFRESHMENTS** **Stonecrop Living Room**

TUESDAY MAY 17, 1988

7:45am - 8:45am **CHECKOUT/BREAKFAST** **Weathervane**

9:00am - 10:30am **CHALLENGES OF COLLABORATION:** Small Group Discussions

A. COLLABORATION BETWEEN EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES **Master Seminar Room**
Facilitators: Fred Bedell, Lew Smith
Resource Person: Alexandria Douglas

B. BUILDING THE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS ADVISORY COMMITTEES **Guggenheim Auditorium**
Facilitator: Cynthia Parsons

Small groups, of mixed composition, will explore issues and challenges involved in collaboration: between educational and social service institutions; and in building effective Advisory Committees.

10:30am - 10:45am **COFFEE BREAK**

10:45am - 12:15pm **REPEAT: CHALLENGES OF COLLABORATION Sessions**

12:30pm - 1:30pm **LUNCH** **Weathervane**

1:30pm - 3:30pm **FORGING OUR NETWORK FOR CHANGE**
Guggenheim Auditorium
Laura J. Pires, Program Officer,
Edwin Gould Foundation

Technical Assistance/Training
Community Schools Day 1988
Evaluation
Feedback and Discussion
Next Steps

CLOSING REMARKS
Alec Dickson, Voluntary Services Overseas

WRAP-UP

EDWIN GOULD FOUNDATION FOR CHILDREN
126 East 31st Street • New York, New York 10016 • (212) 481-0170

NEW YORK STATE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PROJECT
SPRING RETREAT
MAY 16-17, 1988

PARTICIPANTS

NAME	AFFILIATION
Abreu, Rosendo	Coordinator, Office of Funded Programs, NYC CSD 7
Alessi, Samuel, Jr.	Acting Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum Evaluation and Development, Buffalo
Alvarado, Anthony	Superintendent, NYC CSD 2
Arrington, Virginia	Acting Superintendent, NYC CSD 16
Astrowsky, Robert	Acting Special Representative for Education Programs, United Federation of Teachers
Ballard, Geraldine	Social Worker, Poughkeepsie
Barr, Bill	Volunteer, Business Community
Bedell, Frederick	Statewide Advisory Committee Assistant Superintendent, Pupil Services, White Plains, New York
Bell, Nathan	Director of Planning and Evaluation, Binghamton
Bloom, Sydelle	Consultant, Edwin Gould Foundation
Blum, Barbara	Chairperson, Statewide Advisory Committee President, Foundtion for Child Development
Brooks, Judith, M.	Principal, Dr. Martin Luther King Elementary School, Syracuse
Caban, David	Principal, Herman Badillo Bilingual Acadamy, Buffalo
Carnahan, Taimi	New York State Department of Health
Chodos, Laura	New York State Board of Regents
Clark, James, Jr.	Superintendent, Poughkeepsie
Cleary, Frank	Superintendent, Binghamton

Cullivan, Robert	Director of Special Programs, Syracuse
Croce, Nancy	New York State Education Department Coordinator, Community Schools Task Force
Davis, Elaine	Statewide Advisory Committee President, Association of Black Educators of New York
DeLeon, Candido	Consultant, New York State Education Department
Deming, William	Statewide Advisory Committee Executive Director, Rural School Programs
Diamond, Bernard	Principal, Alternative Education Complex JHS 117, NYC CSD 4
r arlo, Clementina	New York State Division of Youth
Dickson, Alec	Founder/President, Voluntary Services Overseas, London, England
Dickson, Mora	Voluntary Services Overseas, London, England
Dodds, Annie	Chairperson of Community School Board, NYC CSD 16
Douglas, Alexandria	Director of "No Time to Lose" and "Decade of the Child", New York State Department of Social Services
Dufort, Lynn	Principal, St. Joseph's P.S.Building, Malone
Fernandez, Dolores	New York State Division for Youth
Fisher, Linda	Director of Communications, New York State Department of Social Services
French, Effie	Resource Teacher, P.S. 126, NYC CSD 2
Genn, Colman	Superintendent, NYC CSD 27
Gordon, Patricia	Edwin Gould Foundation, Trustee Executive Director, Indian Youth of America, Sioux City Iowa
Haley, Paul	Consultant, Edwin Gould Foundation Coordinator, New York Assistance Center at Buffalo
Haust, Mary	Project Coordinator, Binghamton

Hazlewood, Ann	New York State Education Department, Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education
Hill, Norbert	Executive Director, American Indian Science and Engineering Society, Boulder, Colorado
Hunt, Cindy	Project Coordinator, Addison
Innes, Martha	Edwin Gould Foundation, Vice President
Kissinger, Martha	President, Board of Education, Binghamton
Klein, Anton, J.	Superintendent, NYC CSD 3
Klein, Jack	Principal, P.S. 126, NYC CSD 2
Kesper, Raymond	New York State Education Department, Community Schools Program
Jones, Eileen	Early Childhood Coordinator, NYC CSD 15
Jones, Mildred	Statewide Advisory Committee New York City Board of Education, Director of SETRIC (Special Education Training and Resource Center) Programs
Jones, Pearl	Principal, P.S. 185, NYC CSD 3
Langlois, Jim	Coordinator of Funded Programs, NYC CSD 2
Leahy, Thomas	Coordinator of Funded Programs, NYC CSD 15
Leidecker, George	Principal, Chester Dewey School #14, Rochester
Leo, Pat	Assistant Director of Special Programs, Syracuse
Loewenthal, Joanne	Project Coordinator, Poughkeepsie
Lyles, Antoinette	Principal, S.F.B. Morse Elementary School, Poughkeepsie
Mabins, Beverly	Lewis Street Community Center, Rochester
Matteoni, Louise	New York State Board of Regents
McInerney, Bernie	New York State Education Department, Pupil Services
Medina, Carlos, M.	Superintendent, NYC CSD 4
Meyer, Schuyler, Jr.	Edwin Gould Foundation for Children, President

Mudry, John	Project Coordinator, NYC CSD 16
Nelson, Yvonne	New York State Education Department, Pupil Services
Newton, Cheryl	Parent, Advisory Council, Syracuse
Page, Liz	Project Coordinator, Syracuse
Palache, Cheryl	Parent, NYC CSD 27
Parent, Debra	Project Coordinator, Malone
Parks, Merrilyn	Project Coordinator, Rochester
Parsons, Cynthia	State Advisory Committee Special Consultant, Edwin Gould Foundation
Peacock, Thomas	Principal, MacArthur School, Binghamton
Perales, Cesar	Commissioner, New York State Department of Social Services
Pettey, Corine	Principal, P.S. 208, NYC CSD 3
Pineiro, Nylsa	Parent, Buffalo
Pires, Laura, J.	Edwin Gould Foundation for Children Program Officer, New York State Community Schools Project
Poissant, Richard	Project Coordinator, Malone
Prieto, Claudio, R.	New York State Education Department, Assistant to Commissioner for Policy Analysis
Quintero, Ana-Helvia	University of Puerto Rico
Rivera, Raymond	Director of Parent Resource Center, NYC CSD 4
Rodriquez, Carmen	Superintendent, NYC CSD 7
Rodriquez, Juan Munoz	Consultant, Edwin Gould Foundation Director of Citywide Parental Involvement Programs, Federation Employment and Guidance Services
Rosa, Aida	Principal, P.S. 30, NYC CSD 7
Sabol, Barbara	Executive Deputy Commissioner, New York State Department of Social Services
Santiago, Orlanda	Parent, NYC CSD 7

Shackler, Gerald	Principal, P.S. 38, NYC CSD 15
Seeley, David	Statewide Advisory Committee Professor of Education, College of Staten Island
Sevayega, Dina	New York State Education Department, Professional Career Opportunities Program
Singleton, Will	Project Coordinator, Addison
Smith, Lew	Consultant, Edwin Gould Foundation Executive Director, University Settlement
Smith, Ned	School Health Program, Bureau of Child Adolescent Health, New York State Department of Health
Sobol, Thomas	Commissioner, New York State Education Department
Soffer, Miriam	Task Force, New York State Education Department
Tainsh, Paul	Project Coordinator, NYC CSD 4
Tauritz, Catherine	Project Coordinator, NYC CSD 15
Taylor, Robert	Principal, P.S. 155, NYC CSD 27
Thomas, Jon, R	Principal, Tuscarora Elementary School, Addison
Warner, A. Lyman	Superintendent, Addison
Webber, Thomas	Statewide Advisory Committee Director, Dr. Lillie May Barton Youth Services, Inc.
Weinberg, Michael	Project Coordinator, P.S. 185, NYC CSD 3
Zimiles, Herbert	The Bruner Foundation

EIGHT COMMUNITY SCHOOL FEATURES

(As Presented by Commissioner Thomas Sobol
Albany, New York March 7, 1988)

1. Year-round schools;

2. School buildings open and accessible all day/all week;

3. Education starting with children as young as possible (e.g. Pre-Kindergarten for 4-year-olds);

4. Parents playing strong and active role and feeling good about schools;

5. Enriched mix of adults and others playing important roles in schools (e.g. older children high school students, older persons);

6. Principals, teachers, other significant people on staff sharing in planning;

7. Schools acting as "brokers" for other services (e.g. health) to make them accessible to children and their families;

8. Curriculum/educational experience very different from the traditional mold.

"We have an outstanding opportunity to rethink what elementary education should be and do. It is not good enough to simply add on A.M. and P.M. programs, if we don't change what's already there. We must demand much more."

March 10, 1988

DR KING
SYRACUSE N.Y.
315-425-458

K.I.N.D.L.E. SLIDE PRESENTATION SCRIPT - 1987

The Dr. King Communication Magnet School was created by the Syracuse Board of Education in June, 1985. Dr. King School services a population that enters Kindergarten significantly delayed in world knowledge, receptive vocabulary, language usage and concept development. In an effort to address the issues of basic skills and language development, the school administrator, in conjunction with the KINDLE Team, proposed wide-reaching reforms that have effected every aspect of the school environment. K.I.N.D.L.E. = The King Initiative to Develop a Learning Environment = targeted basic skills instruction, language development, and the broadening of each child's knowledge of the world as the most important components of the Communication Magnet concept.

The KINDLE Team has met for the last two years during the summer as well as throughout the school year to plan programs and monitor and evaluate progress. Now that we are in the second year of our program, we would like to review the most crucial elements of our accomplishments at Dr. King. We consider these elements to be the roots of our KINDLE program.

Language has been the structure under which all content area curricula have been organized. School-wide thematic units, called Special Instructional Units, integrate Syracuse City School District content curricula (Social studies, science, health, music, art and physical education) with the Language Arts strands. The school year has been divided into 6 six-week blocks of time, each of which has a different thematic emphasis. The first unit, "We Are the Children", for instance, involves social studies and health curriculum objectives. The current unit, "We Are the Growing World", is a science unit, based on living things. All projects, field trips, displays, culminating

activities, vocabulary, common knowledges, classroom activities and communications to parents, reflect the current theme. Consistency in emphasis, Adjusted Kindergarten through 4th grades, is maintained building-wide. The Special Instructional Units, in addition to emphasizing language and information acquisition, have served to unify content material being presented at all grade levels. The integrated, thematic units have been a most successful and gratifying component of the KINDLE Program over the past two years.

Field trips are an ~~integral~~ aspect of the Special Instructional Units. In attempting to broaden the students' knowledge of the world about them, each field trip is reflective of the current unit of study. This year teams have visited Agway Dairy Farm, Carpenter's Brook Fish Hatchery, Highland Forest, and Burnet Park Zoo. All field trips are preceded by lessons which focus on vocabulary, information-to-be-gained and questions to be answered on-site. Follow-up activities are numerous and include class stories, letters of appreciation, reports and research projects. The universal consensus among staff is that field trips provide an outstanding educational experience for our children.

Students of all ages and all grade levels are benefitting academically from learning through experience. Terika Nelson, a kindergarten student, remembers details of her classes' field trip to Carpenter's Brook Fish Hatchery. "We went to the fish hatchery. We learned about three kinds of fish. Rainbow trout, brown trout and brook trout. I put the fish food in the water and the fish jumped up and ate it". Jeremiah Thornton, a second grade student tells us of his October visit to the Plumpkin Pumpkin Farm. "We went to the pumpkin farm.

We learned that the pumpkins grow on a vine. When the pumpkin first sprouts its green, then it turns orange then its ripe and ready to pick". Faith Gilliam, a fourth grade student describes the process of making maple syrup which her class observed on their trip to the Cedarvale Maple Farm. "We went to Cedarvale Maple Farm. The sap comes from maple trees. There were plastic tubes connecting the trees. The farmer goes out and cuts the tubes and drains all the sap out. There was a room where he boiled the sap. The sap was different colors as it cooked. The farmer took the sap and put it in a window to cool down. He built boxes out of trees he cuts down. He uses the boxes to send bottles of syrup. We tasted thin and thick maple syrup. The thick maple syrup tasted really sweet."

Culminating activities are a second important component of the Thematic Units. At the conclusion of each unit, students are involved in projects which demonstrate what they learned during the previous six weeks. Following "We Are the Communicating World" unit, for instance, the children prepared a celebration of Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday to which the community, Mayor Young, Superintendent Meno and the Syracuse Board of Education were invited. The program included a variety of communication media, including drama, choral speaking, call/response poetry and a slide show. A science fair was the culminating activity for "We Are the Growing World" and" and International Day highlighted the theme, "We Are Many, We Are One". These culminating activities provide an important opportunity for students to demonstrate knowledge, gain confidence in front of an audience and to express language in a variety of ways. Additionally, since parents and community members are always

invited to attend these presentations, public awareness of our program is enhanced. Thus, through Thematic Units, field trips and culminating activities, language acquisition and expression are continuously emphasized and reinforced.

Another root element of our program is our grade-level teams. Each of the grade levels at Dr. King - adjusted kindergarten, kindergarten, first, second, third and fourth - operates as a team. Although individual teachers make specific instructional decisions affecting individual students, grade level teachers and teaching assistants approach their goal of teaching students at Dr. King as a team. Teaching assistants, help provide small group instruction, assist with paperwork, and become involved in classroom activities and projects. Their active presence and supervision at arrival and dismissal times, during breakfast and lunch and in music, art, physical education and library sessions with their classes help to create a consistent and positive atmosphere in the school.

In addition to teachers and teacher assistants, funded resource personnel have been assigned to grade-level teams to work with students eligible for remedial instruction. These reading specialists meet with team teachers during planning time each week to coordinate. Their programs for the children they service. They work with individual students, small groups and occasionally large groups within the classroom setting. Since they "push in" to the classroom rather than "pull out" students, they work closely and cooperatively with classroom teachers to plan and provide consistent, productive instruction.

Team planning time is an essential part of the team approach to teaching at Dr. King. By reorganizing our weekly schedule, grade-level teams have time twice a week to plan together. Each team meets in the Teacher's Resource Room,

where they make use of materials organized by our instructional specialist. During these twice weekly planning sessions, teachers share ideas for classroom activities, describe and compare their instructional strategies and techniques and coordinate the content of their lessons. Teachers also use this time to plan field trips and culminating activities and to discuss individual student needs. This team planning time is an immensely valuable process for the development of our staff and for the achievement of our students.

The blocks of time needed for team planning are scheduled when students are participating in their "special" classes of music, art, library or physical education. These classes and their teachers are known as the "Expressive Academics" team at Dr. King. The original KINDLE team recognized the academic contribution of these more expressive classes and proposed a team of full-time specialists in oral and visual communications, library media and physical education.

The Expressive Academics team is another important root for KINDLE. They plan together to integrate their lessons into the whole-school Thematic Units. When students attend these "special" classes, they participate in activities which reinforce classroom instruction. The activities are planned to coordinate with each grade-level teams' plans for the Thematic Unit. For example, during the unit "We Are the Future", one week the first grade made mobiles of planets in their art class and later made body shapes and motions of rocket ships in their physical education class.

The team leader for the Expressive Academics team is the Language Development Coordinator, who works with the team to help them incorporate

language skills into their lessons. She works with the team to coordinate school performances, special events and the school's literary magazine, "The Curious King". Additionally, the Language Development Coordinator provides small and large group instruction in language arts in adjusted kindergarten, kindergarten and first grade. Students respond enthusiastically to listening and speaking activities involving her puppet, Cora the cow.

Parents, of course, are a key element in supporting the educational process. At. Dr. King, the full time parent-coordinator has organized a variety of services and activities to attract parents to school. Through home visits, parenting classes, community outreach workshops, and panel discussions with community leaders, parents have been meaningfully involved in educational issues. Our parent coordinator has also recruited a group of parent volunteers to work in classrooms and has been effective in contacting parents to serve on the King Parent-Teacher Organization.

The KINDLE team will be developing a training program for parent volunteers in the classroom. The KINDLE team will also create a guide for the parent coordinator to use to plan activities and workshops for parents which will directly relate to our whole-school Thematic Units. In this way, we hope to involve parents in extending our KINDLE program at home.

Student achievement is the ultimate goal of the KINDLE program. Like pieces of a complex puzzle, all our programs and efforts are designed to increase basic competencies and prepare our students to meet future challenges as students, employees and productive citizens. Many of these achievements can be measured. Let's look at our standarized test scores for the last 2 years. We can see from the results of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, which was administered to all students, Adjusted Kindergarten through 4th grades,

that the average student enters any given grade level significantly delayed in understanding language and in experience of the world. This fact is the most serious challenge to those of us - teachers, administrators, board members - deeply concerned with educational programs. Poverty of communication skills and the lack of world experience are not problems we can expect will change easily. Progress is slow and remediation difficult. We can proudly say, however, that the KINDLE program and the dedicated staff at Dr. King have made a substantial impact on increased student achievement.

Previous to the C.A.R. designation and the intervention by Superintendent Heno and the Board of Education, the average student scored in the 23rd percentile on the S.R.A. reading test and in the 33rd percentile on the math test. In May, 1986 the average growth in reading was 9.6 percentile, while the growth achieved in the average math score was a phenomenal 16.7! At the same time, there was an 8% increase in students scoring at or above the 50th percentile in reading and a 19% increase in math.

The results of the PEP tests are equally gratifying. On the average, between 1983 and 1985, 68% of Dr. King 3rd graders scored below the state reference point in reading; 44% were below in math. Last year's test results showed significant improvement and this year's results, though unofficially tabulated by hand-scoring the reading section, indicate positive growth: approximately 30% more students scored at or above the state reference point in reading. Such growth on test scores is encouraging evidence that the long-range goal of increased student achievement is becoming a reality at Dr. King Communication Magnet School.

The past two years have been an exciting educational experience for staff,

students, and parents at Dr. King. Mrs. Brooks, Principal and the entire staff at Dr. King school wish to thank Superintendent Meno and the Syracuse Board of Education for their continued support of our efforts to create an effective learning environment for all students at Dr. King School. In closing, we would like to share with you a choral recitation performed by our kindergarten students entitled, "I am Somebody". These young students believe, as we all do at Dr. King, that all children can learn.

State-Wide Program Training Conference

Schools as Community Sites Pilot Project

Rensselaersville, New York
May 16 and 17, 1988

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PROGRAMS
in
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 7

Carmen A. Rodriguez
Community Superintendent

New York City Board of Education
Community School District 7
501 Courtlandt Avenue
Bronx, New York 10451

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 7
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

Introduction

Community School District 7 has had a long standing commitment to increasing parental involvement in its schools. Through numerous efforts, parents have been given the opportunity to play a vital role in the education of their children.

The elected comunity school board members, the community superintendent and staff recognize that parents are the most significant factors in children's lives. Accepting this premise and the fact that parents in our community face many personal difficulties, the district has initiated programs which address the multi-layered needs of the student and parent population.

To understand those needs, it is important to have insight into the demographic profile of the district. Community School District 7 located in the South Bronx, in New York, is situated in an area with a demographic profile which includes high rates of adult illiteracy, substance abuse, mental and physical health problems and unemployment. The district ranks 32nd out of 32 districts on the poverty index, which indicates that 74.7% of the district's students are members of low income families. The school population is comprised of approximately 68% Hispanic students and 32% Black students. The district serves one of the highest concentrations of Spanish-speaking students in New York City. The twenty-two schools in the district have provided a stable and safe environment for the community which has lost more than half of its student population in the last 15 years. This major loss of students followed a rapid loss of housing due to fires and landlord abandonment.

Without appropriate intervention and support, both parents and students can become isolated in this environment. It is because of these conditions that District 7 saw the urgency to provide supportive programs to increase parental involvement using non-traditional approaches. The characteristics of the parental involvement programs in District 7 are multi-faceted. Parent programs include: training programs for parent school-volunteers, classes in adult basic and continuing education, parenting and life skills. Many of the programs are designed to help parents provide a more secure and supportive environment in the home, thus making parents a vital link and partner in the education of their children.

The following outlines the parental involvement programs and services that District 7 has implemented over the last thirteen years.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PROGRAMS
1975 - 1988
PRE - K to KINDERGARTEN

1975

PRIMARY READING OBJECTIVES FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION (PROBE)

This project focused on the creation of a stimulating bilingual classroom environment primarily conducted in Spanish for four and five year old children in two schools in the district. The children and their parents were involved in the process of improving the rate of reading growth and cognitive development early in the child's experience. There was a strong emphasis on oral language, sensory-motor coordination and training in reasoning. Cultural heritage, music and art were introduced as vehicles of enrichment and self-concept. The language experience approach was used to improve skills in all the necessary curriculum areas. Parents of children, "volunteer parent coordinators," were required to work in the classroom assisting in the learning centers on a weekly rotating basis under the direction of the teacher. An educational assistant helped the coordinator, assisting parents with problems and contacting agencies.

1979

BILINGUAL EDUCATION: BENEFITS AT AN EARLY AGE (BEBES)

Kindergarten children were involved in a variety of classroom activities that emphasized oral language and concept development in Spanish and English as a Second Language through first hand experiences with appropriate materials and techniques. Through varied experiences, children used all their senses to develop intellectually, socially, and emotionally. They were able to strengthen their native language while also learning a second language in a living community situation. Cooperating parents of participating children, were assigned to assist teachers in the implementation of the program by becoming directly involved in classroom practices and techniques that can be carried over to the child's home environment.

1982 - PRESENT

PARENT - CHILD LEARNING CENTER ECC II/P.S. 30

The Parent - Child Learning Center ECCII/P.S. 30, funded as a New York State Experimental Pre - Kindergarten site, is a model site for parent involvement activities. Both children and parents are involved in learning activities at a modern educational facility. Parents participate in Child Development Workshops and Adult Education Classes.

The parent program provides opportunities for parents to actively participate in the Pre-Kindergarten program. Using a puppetry theme, parents are introduced to developmental skills that children are in the process of mastering. During workshops and participation in the classroom, parents are exposed to the following:

- The educational materials used in the classroom.
- Patterns of child development and how the young child learns through play.
- Making and developing educational materials for use at home and in school.
- The social services availablein the immediate community and the community at large.
- Children's literature: reading, narrating, acting and performing stories with puppets.
- Skills development in arts and crafts: making different kinds of puppets, using a pattern, designing, drawing, painting and sewing costumes and scenery for puppet shows.
- Cooperation through sharing, communicating, planning and implementing educational and cultural activities for the children.
- Use of community trips as learning experiences for parent and child.
- Exploring, discovering and experimenting with new materials and experiences.
- Disposition and willingness to learn by participating in a positive school environment.
- Assertiveness and leadership by being active participants in school organizations and activities.
- Self-esteem, by succeeding in parenting in school activities.

Adult Life Skills Workshops for parents are conducted on the following topics:

- **Community Awareness**
  Parents are trained to use resources available to them in their community. They are encouraged to attend PTA and Community School Board Meetings.

- **Parents as Volunteers**
  Parents are trained to assist the classroom teacher, encouraging children to explore and make discoveries with a variety of materials that support problem solving and concept formation.

- **Introduction to Career Awareness**
  Parents are encouraged to take classes in ESL and GED in community based adult education programs.

- **Educational System Awareness**
  Parents are trained to understand classroom procedures and the learning process.

- **Adult Consumer and Homemaking Education**
  Parents learn more about parenting, building good nutritional habits, coping and managing skills, money management, health and safety, housing, legal rights, public assistance, personal and community resourses.

Adult Education Classes

The parent program additionally provides Basic Literacy classes an a daily basis. Parents may choose to attend English as a Second Language classes, Reading and Math classes (pre-GED) and/or assist in the classroom environment.

:983

PARTNERSHIP WITH PARENTS OF SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN

In the ECIA Chapter 2 program, *Partnership with Parents of School Age Children*, parents were given the opportunity to observe and to volunteer their services in the classroom a minimum of one hour per week. The parent-volunteers attended training sessions and were also able to observe teaching techniques and the use of appropriate educational materials. The program coordinator conducted the following parent workshops: The All-Day Kindergarten Program, Characteristics of the Kindergarten Child, How Parents Can Help Teachers in Relation to: Attendance, Health and Safety, Pre-Reading and Pre-Writing Activities, Importance of Learning a Second Language, Nutrition in the Home, Computer Education, and Child Abuse and Neglect. Activities for staff training of participating kindergarten teachers included a workshop on acquiring techniques for improving parent participation, presentation of literature related to parental involvement, and discussion of various instructional programs and the parents' role in each program.

1983

PARENTS AS PARTNERS IN SCHOOLS

Parents as Partners in Schools, funded under ESEA Title VII, initiated the implementation of a three-year program for students, parents and teachers on September 1982. It established a partnership between the home and the school in District 7. It was anticipated that parental involvement in the schools would have a significant effect on student academic achievement, specifically in English language proficiency and reading in Spanish. Participating LEP students developed the necessary skills in English to function in English language classes as well as increased their skills in Spanish Reading. Parents were actively involved in school and community related activities, and opportunities were provided for greater participation in bilingual programs.

ELEMENTARY LEVEL

1987 - Present

P.S. 30 - PARENTS AS LEADERS (PAL)

P.S. 30 provides an extended school day program for students and parents. Parents are offered classes in GED Spanish / English, English as a Second Language and Parenting Skills. Parents are also trained to assist in classes grades K-5. This site provides the link between the parent programs at ECC # 2 and I.S. 139. This is the identified School As Community site. A much expanded program will begin during the 1988-89 school year.

INTERMEDIATE LEVEL

1979 - Present

COMPREHENSIVE ADULT LEARNING LABORATORIES (PROJECT CALL)

This project provides morning and afternoon classes in English as a second Language, Basic reading, math and life skills. Parents were recruited district-wide to participate in this program offering pre-GED and pre-employment opportunities. A comprehensive service offering counseling, referral and advanced school placement is provided. Workshops concerning health, legal housing and employment issues supplement the daily instructional program. District 7 was the first N.Y.C. School district to receive these funds from the State Department of Education Division of continuing education as a Community based organization.

1987 - 1988

DISTRICT 7 CULTURAL ARTS AND RESOURCE CENTER

This project has provided extensive parent and child programs in three district schools, P.S. 30, P.S. 40 and I.S. 139. Classes for parents are held during the day, evenings and on Saturdays. GED English, GED Spanish, Computer Literacy/Word Processing, Employment and Career Counseling, Dancercise, Performing and Creative Arts Classes are among the offerings. A performance series provided by the South Bronx Community Action Theater is open to the surrounding community.

1988 - PRESENT

DISTRICT 7 SCHOOLS AS COMMUNITY SITES PROJECT

Beginning in the Fall of 1988, the program will focus activities at P.S. 30 and its Early Childhood Center Annex. The middle school site, I.S. 139, will continue to be involved in the parental involvement aspects of the program, and as the site for the Adult Education evening program. The purpose of the middle school's involvement is two-fold: first, to continue the active parent participation which occurs at the elementary school, and which tends to diminish as the students move to the new setting, and second, due to the fact that the middle school provides a more appropriate physical plant for the adult activities.

Parent participation in the new cycle will take place through the following:

- parent education program at the Early Childhood Center (see page 3)
- daytime parent education program at P.S. 30
- evening adult education activities at I.S. 139
- volunteer program at both sites
- involvement in advisory council
- parent/child learning programs
- parent as leaders activities

There are various rationales for this effort. Among them are:

- The school can exhert great positive influence on parents in a community such as District 7's. Our programs have been successful in encouraging parents to complete their education and improve their economic status. This in turn provides a direct positive effect on the students;

- The school can serve as a bridge to resources in the community that otherwise would not reach many parents. Language and cultural barriers are often overcome through the services of school staff;
- Children who live in a poverty environment need as much enrichment as can be provided. Their parents can be trained to provide this enrichment.
- Parents can be the link in the effort to "re-capture" other parents who are alienated or uninvolved in the public schools. They can show each other the way, that the public schools belong to them and that their involvement is crucial to the education of their children;
- The schools need help. Parents can contribute in many ways in the everyday activities of the school performing many tasks in and out of the classroom that support the rest of the professional and administrative staff.

The Community Schools Project will permit a continuum of activities that we hope in the near future will extend from pre-natal care to the time when children are ready to enter high school. It is expected that they will be better prepared than otherwise possible physically, educationally, and affectively, and that a support system will have been developed that will assist them through their high school years and beyond.

DISTRICTWIDE

1988- Present

District 7 organizes and implements extensive parent involvement projects at the district level. An extremely active Parent Advisory Council and Parent Association are involved in reviewing programs and advising the Community Superintendent and Community School Board on educational matters. Each year these organizations sponsor an educational conference which attracts hundreds of parents. The district celebrated its 12th year of PAC conferences this past April. Students, parents and staff joined together to provide educational workshops and artistic performances.

Conclusion

Parental involvement programs are vital to the educational system. These programs benefit the parent, the student and the school community. Through meaningful involvement parents provide their children with a role model that demonstrates that education is important and a lifelong process. Community School District 7 firmly believes that schooling is a partnership. Parents, students and professionals working toward a common goal can truly impact our educational system.

Appendix E

5/11/88

BINGHAMTON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

DR. NATHAN BELL

MAY 16, 1988

EARLIEST INTERVENTIONS AND COMMUNITY LINKAGES

Today, we want to approach the topic of community linkages from a narrower perspective than our whole School as Community Site Project. We'll focus on one sub-project and how it has resulted in substantial linking of various community agencies. We take this approach: first, to point up the fact that even one component of an overall project can contribute significantly to linkages; and second, to highlight a component of our School as Community Site Project that is on the cutting edge of innovation, that will dramatically improve student performance in school, and that will reduce the dropout rate to a trickle.

Our emphasis today will be on Binghamton's unique early, early intervention program. In the Binghamton project, we begin our dropout prevention effort even before children are born--as early as the third trimester of pregnancy. We do this: first, because we believe, as you do, in the importance of early intervention and the role parents must play in education, and second, because the new research about how early children can learn is dramatic and compelling.

Let's start with our beliefs.

First and foremost, we believe we need to begin early. We believe school success begins at home well before kindergarten

enrollment day. All of us know children come to our kindergartens on the very first day of school unequal--not only in ability but in the opportunities that have been available to them. Some kindergarteners are behind even before the school year begins. Unfortunately, "once behind, always behind" becomes for many of them a cruel reality.

Second, we believe parents are a major influence. We know children's attitudes toward school are set by parents. What parents do and say does directly influence their children's motivation and achievement. To be really effective, any effort to reach parents must begin when the children are still infants, when strong maternal and paternal feelings are still present, when the children are small.

There is good news! We know that during the years prior to kindergarten, all children learn more and at a faster pace than at any other time in their lives. We know that an enormous amount of learning takes place at home where parents are the only teachers. And there is concrete evidence that preparing parents to be first teachers can make a big difference to young children regardless of economic background.

Now, let's look at the research:

First: Parents do want to help. But, just as teachers and schools can't go it alone, neither can parents. The trouble isn't that parents don't care. They do. The trouble is our schools haven't responded with ways to show them how to help. Even those families that are considered hard to reach care deeply about their children's education.

Second: Parents not only want to help, they can be very effective. Experts recognize that the things parents do with their children before school begins can help with later success in school.

New studies confirm that the most effective way to involve parents is to empower them as home-style teachers. We educators have always known intuitively what research is now telling us--that parents are the most important teachers of children. Dallas Superintendent Linus Wright said it bluntly: "We can put in all the fancy new programs, attendance policies, codes of conduct, and the best curricula in the world, but unless we get parents involved in the education process, we won't be successful in what we are doing.

Third: Children have the ability to learn at a very young age. Learning doesn't begin when a child walks through the school room door. Learning begins at home. By age four, half of a child's intelligence has already been formed. Two-thirds to three quarters of all usable language is acquired by the age of three. We can push back even earlier than age three. A wealth of new knowledge about the earliest years of life reveals important things about infants. They learn, they respond, and they interact from the earliest moments of their lives.

The message for us is clear: development in these early years is just too important to leave to chance.

Fourth: Early interventions do work.

The Highscope study of Headstart that followed children from pre-school to age 19 showed children who participated in Headstart out-performed those who didn't. By the end of high school the benefits were enormous--lower rates of juvenile crime, lower rates of welfare dependency, lower rates of teenage pregnancy, and greater success at school.

On the heels of that study was the release in 1985 of some startling information about a pilot project in four Missouri school

districts. ,The project involved efforts with children from infancy to age three. The approach was unusual because the work wasn't done with children directly. Rather, it showed how training parents can result in greater mental growth and better health for children. The project was so successful that Harvard's Burton White, said, "This is the strongest stuff I've seen in 28 years of working in child development." He said, "The implications are wonderful for children and families and revolutionary for public education."

In response to this research, Binghamton has initiated an array of early intervention programs. Our most exciting one is modeled on the Missouri experiment. Our "Parents and Children Together", or PACT, Project aims at helping parents become better first teachers of their children....during the critical period from birth to age three.

Early last year, we hired and trained parent educators. We renovated an unused elementary school space, and we opened a parent resource center. By last summer, we were offering services to new parents.

The services feature group get-togethers at the resource center as well as private home visits where parent educators meet one-to-one with parents. Our services begin early...during the third trimester of pregnancy, and they will continue until a child is three years old.

We provide comprehensive services to monitor the intellectual, the language, and the social progress of children. And we've set up an extensive referral system to provide parents with special help they might need. In other words, parents are virtually guaranteed their children won't develop an educational problem without their

knowing about it almost immediately, and, if a problem is discovered, they get appropriate information about where and how to get help.

In another 18 months we'll undertake an ex-post-facto evaluation of the children participating and of a control group. We fully expect the children who are participating in this project will have statistically significantly higher IQ's, greater vocabularies, and more social abilities than children who are not in the program. The result will be that we will have children who will come to public school readier to learn than they otherwise would have been.

To ensure the effects of this early intervention project are maintained, we plan to begin a Headstart three year old pre-kindergarten program in September to receive PACT program graduates. We plan a subsequent pre-kindergarten when these children reach age four. And, when they enter kindergarten, they will be supported by efforts from our SUNY Binghamton-City School District Stay-in-School-Project. All of these--Headstart, Pre-K, and the SUNY-Partnership--maintain and emphasize the training of parents as home teachers.

To sum up, Binghamton has developed an array of approaches to help both parents and children. To make a difference for young children, we try to reach them early when foundations are still being laid.

An extended school day and year, improved teaching techniques, community involvement in the schools, schools as community centers, and other innovations enhance our efforts. But we firmly believe these enhancements will be effective only if parents are able to help to ready their children for a successful public school experience.

We're confident our efforts will produce remarkable results--more successful students, more satisfied parents, and many fewer dropouts 15 to 18 years from now.

NEW YORK STATE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PILOT PROJECT
SPRING RETREAT: MAY 16-17, 1988
FEEDBACK SHEET

What role best describes your involvement with the project? Regent, Superintendent, Principal, Parent, Education Department Staff, Social Service Department Staff, Project Coordinator, Local District Staff, Advisory Committee Member, Other)

If other, please specify: _____

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful	Did Not Attend
1. How would you rate the "Commissioners' Dialogue" on Monday afternoon in terms of providing you with information, ideas or resources about how to create an effective community school?	VH	H	NH	DNA
2. How would you rate the session "Toward Community Schools: Examples of Program Features?"	VH	H	NH	DNA
3. How would you rate the small group discussions held on Monday afternoon?	VH	H	NH	DNA
Which group did you attend?	A	B	C	D E
4. How would you rate the Monday evening session, "State & Local Resources for Community Schools?"	VH	H	NH	DNA
5. How would you rate the Monday evening presentations, "Getting Closer to Community Schools?"	VH	H	NH	DNA
6. How would you rate the small group discussions held on Tuesday morning?	VH	H	NH	DNA
7. How would you rate the closing session held on Tuesday afternoon?	VH	H	NH	DNA
8. How would you rate the overall retreat in terms of providing you with information, ideas or resources about how to create an effective community school?	VH	H	NH	

On the other side of this sheet please address any comments, concerns or ideas for follow-up that have arisen during the conference.

INVENTORY OF SOCIAL SERVICES 1988-89 RFP PROGRAMS WHICH SUPPORT COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

The State Education Department has now identified 14 Community School sites across the state where school facilities will be available for an extended school day and year, and they will provide instructional activities such as homework assistance, tutoring and mentoring and enrichment activities **plus** supportive services to children, parents and residents of the community.

Because the services to be provided by Community Schools include a wide range of counseling, social services and recreational programs to meet the needs of children and adults in the community, the Community Schools projects will be expected to link up with existing service agencies which provide these services in the community, and to work closely with local social services districts and existing community based service providers to coordinate service delivery.

When the Community Schools project coordinator and the Advisory Board have determined that the existing resources in the community are not sufficient to meet the needs of children and adults in the community, plans may be developed to improve coordination of existing services, to expand existing services or to seek additional funds to develop new services to address unmet needs.

There are a number of vehicles available to Community Schools which seek to develop additional services to the community. First, the project coordinator would seek to develop agreements with existing service providers in the locality to expand services in some way to better serve the Community School population. (See the coordination/cooperation inventory). However, if additional resources must be found to address your program development needs, the Community School may want to seek public and/or private support, either directly--or indirectly, by working through a community based organization which currently provides the needed service, or effectively reaches the target population you need to serve.

Many state and local government agencies administer competitive requests for proposals to develop or expand services to families and communities. The attached list is an inventory of the Requests for Proposals to be released by the New York State Department of Social Services within the 1988-89 state fiscal year.

Under separate cover, the Department has provided a comprehensive listing of the services which may be provided by local social services departments under cooperative agreements with the Community School program coordinators, and the names of local DSS contact persons for every district in which a Community School project is under development.

INVENTORY OF 1988-89 REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS

Program & DSS Contact	Funding Level	Description of Program Goals	Targeted Clients (providers)
CHILD WELFARE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM W. Phillips (518-474-9437)	$500,000	Community Based Preventive Services	Families & Children at Risk of Foster Care (MBE)
TEENAGE PREGNANCY PROGRAM W. Phillips (518-474-9437)	$50,000	Self-Sufficiency with emphasis on Education and Employment Goals	High risk, pregnant and parenting teens
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TRANSITION HOUSING W. Phillips (518-474-9437)	$150,000	Transitional Housing	Victims of Domestic Violence & Children
FEDERAL CHILD ABUSE GRANTS W. Phillips (518-474-9437)	$400,000	Child Abuse Prevention & Treatment	New Service Development (Local DSS)
DAY CARE START-UP GRANTS Lola Cole (518-474-9618)	$5 MILLION	Start-up funds for Family Day Care; Center Care and Infant Care; in high need areas	(Not-for Profits; MBE/WBE)
SCHOOL AGE CHILD CARE PROGRAM Elaine Markham (518-474-3775)	$600,000	Start-up of after school day care programs	High need areas
COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY SUPPORT CENTER Mark Solazzo (518-474-9300)	$12,595,000	Training, Employment and Support Services to AFDC Caretakers of Children under 6	

FOOD STAMP NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM Cindy Cotrona (518-474-4230)	$1 MILLION	Media project statewide (NYC & 5 regions)	Food stamp recipients & eligibles INC. low-income, the elderly; unemployed; shelter residents; working poor.
REHOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM Kathy Napoli (518)473-6658	$2 MILLION	Assist homeless families to obtain, manage and keep permanent, quality affordable housing (Local DSS's and Not for Profits)	
HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM Kathy Napoli (518-473-6658)	$2 MILLION	Create new or expanded programs that increase the stock of available low-income housing for the homeless. At least 20% of funds must go to not-for-profit corporations to secure residential leases for PA families who have been placed out of county in emergency accommodations. (Local DSS's and not-for-profits)	
OPTIONAL PREVENTIVE SERVICES Renee Bradley (518-432-2522)	$2 MILLION State Approp.	County administered program to provide family support services to families with children at less risk of foster care, or to communities with high rates of family dysfunction (Local DSS submit plans for State DSS approval)	

LOCAL SOCIAL SERVICES DISTRICT CONTACT PERSONS FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOLS INITIATIVE

New York City: to be determined. Address questions to
Mr. William Grinker, Commissioner
Human Resources Administration
250 Church Street
New York, New York 10013

Upstate, by Site:

Rochester: Ms. Michelle Walsh, Coordinator of Social Education
Monroe County Department of Social Services
111 Westfall Road, Room 310
Rochester, New York 14620
(716) 274-6580

Binghamton: Mr. Rick Priebe, Program Planning Analyst
Broome County Department of Social Services
36-39 Main Street
Binghamton, New York 13905
(607) 772-2573

Malone: Mr. Orra Langdon, Commissioner
Franklin County Department of Social Services
Court House
Malone, New York 12953
(518) 483-6767

Poughkeepsie: Ms. Eleanor Andrews, Director of Children's Services
Dutchess County Department of Social Services
60 Market Street
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601
(914) 431-5318

Syracuse: Mr. Robert J. Stone, Commissioner
Onondaga County Department of Social Services
421 Montgomery Street
Syracuse, New York 13202
(315) 425-2985

Addison: Mr. Loren J. Clark, Director of Services
Steuben County Department of Social Services
3 East Pultney Square
Bath, New York 14810
(607) 776-7611, ext. 2040

Erie: Ms. Olga Mendel, Administrative Consultant/
Public Affairs
Erie County Department of Social Services
814 Rath Building
95 Franklin Street
Buffalo, New York 14202
(716) 846-6574